

PATENT

App. Ser. No.: 10/078,605

Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010345US1

PS Ref. No.: IBMK10345

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated September 21, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on December 21, 2005. Applicants submit this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-2 and 4-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1-2 and 4-30 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 5, and 21-30 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 21-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. The Examiner takes the position that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants submit that claims 21-28 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2 and 4-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matson et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,668,254, hereinafter *Matson*) in view of *Landry* (U.S. Patent 5,649,117).

The Examiner takes the position that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine *Matson's* system of processing new data into a database with *Landry's* method of defining records as transaction" to make the present invention.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there

Page 8

407430_1

PATENT

App. Ser. No.: 10/078,605
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010345US1
PS Ref. No.: IBMK10345

must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143. The present rejection fails to establish at least the third criterion.

Matson discloses an import manager for importing product data to a product database from different sources and in different formats (Abstract). *Matson* teaches downloading a dataset from a data source, reviewing the downloaded dataset using a differential analysis, extracting the downloaded dataset to a standard format, and storing the extracted dataset to the product database (Figure 2, column 4 lines 34-49, column 5 lines 18-19, and column 6 line 66 - column 7 line 2). *Matson* teaches conducting a differential analysis to the whole dataset and extracting all the information from the dataset (column 4 lines 23-26, column 4 lines 36-38, column 5 lines 27-29, and column 5 lines 35-39). However, *Matson* does not teach determining whether a new log entry comprises one or more *required* fields. In fact, *Matson* does not teach any processing being done on the basis of *required* fields. To the contrary, *Matson* specifically teaches extracting all information from a dataset, regardless of whether any particular fields are present (column 5 lines 27-29, and column 5 lines 35-39). No determination of whether required fields are present in the dataset is done by *Matson*. Therefore, *Matson* does not teach determining if a new log entry comprises required fields before extracting the new log entry, as set forth in the claims. Therefore, the rejection is believed to be improper, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Furthermore, *Matson* teaches using a differential analysis to determine if the current downloaded dataset includes new data, and parsing (extracting) every field from the download dataset to a standard format (column 5 lines 27-29, and column 5 lines 35-39). However, *Matson* does not teach using mapping rules that describe a location and format of one or more required fields to determine whether a new log entry comprises the one or more required fields, as set forth in the claims. This conclusion follows because, as noted above, no determination of whether required fields are present in the dataset is done by *Matson*. Since *Matson* does not examine the dataset for required fields, it follows that *Matson* does not teach using mapping rules that

Page 9

407430_1

PATENT

App. Ser. No.: 10/078,605

Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010345US1

PS Ref. No.: IBMK10345

describe a location and format of one or more required fields to determine the presence of one or more required fields. Therefore, the rejection is believed to be improper, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Further, *Matson* does not teach extracting information from the new log entry only if the new log entry comprises the one or more required field, as set forth in the claims. Again, as noted above, *Matson* does not teach data extraction that is contingent on the presence of required fields. Therefore, the rejection is believed to be improper, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Landry teaches a system and method for paying bills without requiring interaction with payors (Abstract). However, *Landry* does not teach a method of maintaining a database for managing a process of a plurality of transactions through two or more applications, as set forth in the claims.

Accordingly, the references, *Matson* and *Landry*, alone or in combination, do not teach, show or suggest determining whether a new log entry comprises one or more required fields using mapping rules that describe a location and a format of at least the one or more required fields, and extracting information from the new log entry only if the new log entry comprises the one or more required fields, as recited in claims 1, 21 and 29, and claims dependent thereon.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

PATENT

App. Ser. No.: 10/078,605


Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010345US1

PS Ref. No.: IBMK10345

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact Gero McClellan, attorney of record, at (336) 643-3065, or the undersigned attorney to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants